UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,435	12/14/2001	Mark Phillips	2222.0820003	6756

26111   7590   12/07/2009
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/017,435	PHILLIPS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	JAMES S. WOZNIAK	2626	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _7/29/2009_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-24 and 36-45_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-24 and 36-45_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 February 2002_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20091009

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In response to the office action from 3/13/2009, the applicant has submitted an
amendment, filed 7/29/2009, amending independent claims 1 and 37-38, while adding claims 39-
45 and arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding a deployment
platform being separate from a development platform *(Amendment, Pages 15-17)*. Applicant's
arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained due to the
reasons listed below in the response to arguments.

2.   In response to the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection directed towards claim 38, the
applicant has amended this claim to indicate that a generic software component is "stored on a
tangible computer-readable medium and configured to be executed by a computing device" and
argues that the claim is now directed to a statutory device *(Amendment, Page 13)*. The examiner
has reviewed the applicant's amendments and arguments and respectfully disagrees. The
amended generic software component is still directed to a stored data structure that is not read by
any active computer hardware component. The limitation "to be executed by a computing
device" is an intended use for the generic software component and is not actively recited in the
claim. As the amended claim does not actively recite this computing device as one of the
system components, the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 38, has been maintained.
Also, the originally filed specification is completely silent as to the meaning of the term

"tangible computer-readable medium". As such this amendment has also necessitated a new

matter rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph which has been set forth below.

3.   In response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection directed towards claim 37,

the applicant has amended the voice application to note that it is stored on a "tangible computer-

readable medium". Although this amended provides the missing element, the processor has been

changed to "a computing". As "device" which is presently deleted was not present in the claims

filed on 12/31/2008, it is assumed that the applicant intended to claim a "computing device". An

objection to this effect has been set forth below. Also, the originally filed specification is

completely silent as to the meaning of the term "tangible computer-readable medium". As such

this amendment has also necessitated a new matter rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

which has been set forth below.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the

following reasons:

        With respect to claim 1, the applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to teach "a

deployment platform separate from a development platform running the development

environment" because it is alleged that Kredo et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,182,045)* says nothing about a

development environment whatsoever and does not support modification to support a

development and deployment environment because they would render his invention

unsatisfactory for its intended purpose *(Amendment, Page 15)*. The applicant further argues that

Marx et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,173,266)* fails to teach the aforementioned limitation because Marx

only appears to suggest that development and deployment occurs within the same environment.

      In response to the applicant's first argument regarding the teachings of Kredo, the

examiner notes that Kredo does address development environments. Kredo shows that an IVR

development/deployment system that consists of various platforms. In Fig. 2, Kredo shows a

computing system platform directed to a administrator/designer *(Element 12)* and one directed to

the actual deployed voice application *(Element 22)*. Kredo also makes note that the IVR system

components can be designed at the Element 12 terminal *(Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*. Thus, Kredo does

teach a development environment platform that is separate from the deployed voice application

(IVR) platform.

      In response to the applicant's second argument regarding the teachings of Kredo, the

examiner notes that no modification to Kredo is necessary because Kredo already teaches

separate development and deployment environments as was described above. Although Marx

may only explicitly teach a single computer platform for voice application component

design/development, Marx's system features the capability of interfacing with a network *(Fig. 3,*

Element 320). Adding Kredo's network structure described above to Marx realizes universal

access to dialog system components *(Kredo, Col. 1, Lines 29-30)*. Thus, it is the combination of

Marx and Kredo that teaches the aforementioned claim limitation. As such, the applicant's

arguments have been fully considered, but are not convincing.

The applicant traverses the art rejection of independent claims 37-38 for reasons similar to claim 1 *(Amendment, Page 17)*. In regards to such arguments, see the response directed towards claim 1.

The art rejections of the remaining dependent claims are traversed for reasons similar to claim 1 *(Amendment, Pages 17-18)*. In regards to such arguments, see the response directed towards claim 1.

The applicant alleges that the new claims define over the prior art of record for reasons similar to claim 1 *(Amendment, Page 18)*. In regards to such arguments, see the response directed towards claim 1 and the rejection of these new claims set forth below.

Claim Objections

5.   **Claims 1-24, 36-42, and 44-45** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1, 37, 38, 40, and 44-45 recite various steps/elements "configured to" perform certain functions. It is not certain whether these functions are part of the claim because they are not positively recited only "configured to" perform them. These functions will be considered as being actively performed for the application of the prior art of record.

Claim 37 recites "a computing to process". As the term "device" which is struck through in the current amendment was not present in the previous claim set, it is believed that "device" is intended to be part of the claim. Thus, it is recommended that the aforementioned limitation should be amended to include the "device" as a --computing device to process-.

Claim 38 recites "a remote central comprising" and "a remote repository". These limitations appear to be incomplete because the first element appears to be the actual repository because it stores generic dialog assets and the second limitation appears to be the interface because the third element requires this interface *(i.e., "via the remote repository interface")*. Thus, it is recommended that the currently struck through "repository" and "interface" be again added to the claim as their removal appears to be part of a typographical error.

Newly added **Claim 39** features a struck through term "voice" in "from *the* voice application". As this claim is new, the removal of this term appears to be in error and it is believed that it should be added to the claim to clarify the current antecedent basis issue *(i.e., "the application")*.

Dependent **claims 2-24, 36, 41-42, and 45** fail to overcome the objections directed towards their associated independent claims, and thus, are also objected to due to minor informalities by virtue of their dependency.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7.   **Claim 44** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Although **claim(s) 44** appear to fall within a statutory category *(i.e., apparatus)*, claim(s)

44 encompass nothing more than logic/software modules as per the specification *(Specification,*

Page 11). Thus, claim(s) 44 are directed to non-statutory subject matter because their scope

includes a computer program embodiment, an abstract data structure which does not fall within

one of the four statutory categories *(i.e., it is directed to a program per se)*. See also MPEP §

2106.IV.B.1.a. Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer readable media are

descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing

functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760

(claim to a data structure *per se* held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define

any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed

aspects of the invention, which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In

contrast, a claimed computer readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural

and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and

hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus

statutory. Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings *per se*, i.e., the

descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical "things." They are neither computer

components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed

computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the

computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer

program's functionality to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9.   **Claims 37, 38, and 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 37-38 and 43 all recite a "tangible computer-readable medium". The originally filed specification is completely silent regarding this term as well as the scope of the mediums that are encompassed by this terminology. Thus, claims 37-38 and 43 fail to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   **Claims 1, 3-11, 16-24, and 36-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Marx et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,173,266)* in view of Kredo et al *(U.S. Patent:*

6,182,045).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Marx discloses:

Utilizing at least one generic software component to develop a specific voice application,

including invoking at least one generic dialog asset from a repository *(Col. 3, Lines 28-39; Col.*

4, Lines 21-33; and Col. 6, Line 39- Col. 7, Line 3; an original predefined dialogue template

used in a specific service, Col. 8, Lines 42-51; and dialogue template libraries and invoking

default parameters in application development, Col. 17, Lines 7-20 and Fig. 8, Elements 810,

820, 830);

Deploying the specific voice application in a deployment environment separate from the

development environment *(development environment libraries and service environment library*

Fig. 8), wherein the deployment includes an instance of the repository *[deployed services having*

default (generic) dialog templates from a baseline library (dialog instances in a service utilizing

default baseline library settings that are not overridden, Col. 17, Lines 28-34) in the form of pre-

recorded default prompts that are provided to a caller (Col. 4, Lines 41-43; and default apology

prompts, Col. 20, Lines 42-57), default dialog configuration parameters (Col. 6, Lines 53-60),

and default vocabularies (example of an implemented service conformation step using a default

vocabulary, Col. 9, Lines 40-46; example of a standard default vocabulary across different

services for responses that tend to be the same, Col. 11, Lines 49-55; use of a completely defined

default vocabulary, Col. 18, Lines 47-56)]; and

Invoking the at least one generic dialog asset from the repository in the deployment environment *(utilizing a predefined default dialogue module in a specific voice application service, Col. 6, Lines 53-60; Col. 8, Lines 42-51; and Col. 17, Lines 21-54)*.

Although the speech application development system taught by Marx features default dialog modules used in a deployment runtime environment and is further equipped with a means of communicating with an external data source *(communication interface/network link that connects a dialog system to remote data equipment , Col. 5, Line 49- Col. 6, Line 8; and Fig. 3, Elements 320 and 322)*, Marx does not explicitly teach that the external data source or host computer stores dialog system files that are utilized in development and runtime deployment or separate deployment and development platforms. Kredo, however, discloses a system featuring designed IVR systems relying on a central server that stores dialog information that is additionally accessible at run-time *(Col. 1, Lines 50-67; Col. 2, Lines 50-61; and Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*. Kredo also shows a computing system platform directed to a administrator/designer *(Fig. 2, Element 12)* and one directed to the actual deployed voice application *(Fig. 2, Element 22)*. Kredo also makes note that the IVR system components can be designed at the Element 12 terminal *(Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*.

Marx and Kredo are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice application management. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Marx with the central server taught by Kredo in order to allow for universal access to dialog system files *(Kredo, Col. 1, Lines 29-30)*.

With respect to **Claim 3**, Marx shows:

The deployment environment further comprises an application server *(computer containing the designed interactive voice application, Fig. 3).*

With respect to **Claim 4**, Marx recites:

The deployment environment further comprises a dialog control component *(Col. 6, Lines 61-64).*

With respect to **Claim 5**, Marx recites:

The deployment environment further comprises a dialog component (Col. 6, Lines 53-60).

With respect to **Claim 6**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises a voice application services layer *(Col. 6, Lines 23-30).*

With respect to **Claim 7**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises a rules integration layer *(Col. 13, Line 59- Col. 14, Line 8).*

With respect to **Claim 8**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises a messaging layer *(Col. 20, Lines 33-41).*

With respect to **Claim 9**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises a voice services layer *(Col. 6, Lines 23-30).*

With respect to **Claim 10**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises a detail tracking layer *(Col. 14, Line 47-Col. 15, Line 5).*

With respect to **Claim 11**, Marx discloses:

The deployment environment further comprises an external system *(Col. 5, Lines 49-67)*.

With respect to **Claim 16**, Marx discloses:

Utilizing one or more generic software components to develop a specific voice

application further comprises utilizing one or more generic software components during a design

phase to develop a specific voice application *(combined dialog modules, Col. 4, Lines 21-33;*

and Col. 8, Lines 19-51).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Marx recites:

The design phase further comprises a dialog design phase *(dialog module ordering to*

create a call flow, Col. 8, Lines 19-51).

With respect to **Claim 18**, Marx recites:

The design phase further comprises a voice coding phase *(Col. 16, Lines 11-25)*.

With respect to **Claim 19**, Marx discloses:

The design phase further comprises a rules definition phase *(Col. 20, Lines 17-32; Col.*

13, Lines 59-67).

With respect to **Claim 20**, Marx recites:

The design phase further comprises a phase wherein custom prompts are generated *(Col.*

12, Line 43- Col. 13, Line 10).

With respect to **Claim 21**, Marx recites:

The design phase further comprises a phase wherein custom grammars are developed *(Col. 17, Lines 35-42; and Col. 18, Line 47- Col. 19, Line 7)*.

With respect to **Claim 22**, Marx discloses:

The design phase further comprises a phase wherein standard prompts are utilized to generate the specific voice user interface *(Col. 18, Lines 30-45)*.

With respect to **Claim 23**, Marx discloses:

The design phase further comprises a phase wherein standard grammars are sued to generate the specific voice user interface *(Col. 18, Lines 47-56)*.

With respect to **Claim 24**, Marx discloses:

The design phase further comprises a system test phase *(Col. 14, Lines 9-24)*.

With respect to **Claim 36**, Marx discloses the use of a default dialog module, including voice data, in a deployment environment, as applied to claim 1, while Kredo teaches that dialog information can be retrieved in a runtime environment from the central server repository *(Col. 1, Lines 50-67; Col. 2, Lines 50-61; and Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*.

With respect to **Claim 37**, Marx discloses:

A repository comprising a generic dialog asset, wherein a generic software component is used to develop the voice application which accesses the generic dialog asset via a interface*(Col. 3, Lines 28-39; Col. 4, Lines 21-33; and Col. 6, Line 39- Col. 7, Line 3; an original predefined dialogue template used in a specific service, Col. 8, Lines 42-51; and interfaced dialogue template library database and invoking default parameters in application development, Col. 17, Lines 7-20 and Fig. 8, Elements 810, 820, 830)*; and

A processor to process the voice application *(computer processor that runs the voice application, Col. 5, Lines 20-39; and Col. 2, Lines 14-22)*, the voice application stored on a tangible computer readable memory *(Fig. 3, Elements 306, 308, 310)* through a method comprising:

Accessing the repository at runtime *(accessing a predefined default dialogue module in a specific executed voice application service, Col. 6, Lines 53-60; Col. 8, Lines 42-51; and Col. 17, Lines 21-54)*; and

Invoking, at runtime, the generic dialog asset from the remote central repository *(utilizing a predefined default dialogue module in a specific voice application service deployment, Col. 6, Lines 53-60; Col. 8, Lines 42-51; and Col. 17, Lines 21-54)*.

Although the speech application development system taught by Marx features default dialog modules used in a deployment runtime environment and is further equipped with an interfacing means of communicating with an external data source *(communication interface/network link that connects a dialog system to remote data equipment , Col. 5, Line 49-Col. 6, Line 8; and Fig. 3, Elements 320 and 322)*, Marx does not explicitly teach that the external data source or host computer stores dialog system files that are utilized in development and runtime deployment or separate deployment and development platforms. Kredo, however, discloses a system featuring designed IVR systems relying on a central server that stores dialog information that is additionally accessible at run-time *(Col. 1, Lines 50-67; Col. 2, Lines 50-61; and Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*. Kredo also shows a computing system platform directed to a administrator/designer *(Fig. 2, Element 12)* and one directed to the actual deployed voice

application *(Fig. 2, Element 22)*. Kredo also makes note that the IVR system components can be designed at the Element 12 terminal *(Col. 3, Lines 8-32)*.

Marx and Kredo are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice application management. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Marx with the central server taught by Kredo in order to allow for universal access to dialog system files *(Kredo, Col. 1, Lines 29-30)*.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 37, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 39 and 44 are similar in scope to claim 1, and thus, are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 1, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale. Also, Marx further teaches a computer having a memory for voice application development (Col. 5, Lines 20-39; and Col. 6, Lines 14-22).

Claim 41 contains subject mater similar to claims 3-10, and thus, is rejected under similar rationale.

With respect to **Claim 42**, Kredo teaches the runtime streaming, as applied to claim 1.

Claim 43 is similar in scope to claim 1, and thus, are rejected under similar rationale. Also, Marx further discloses method implementation as a program stored on a computer readable medium *(Col. 6, Lines 14-22; and Col. 5, Lines 20-39)*.

With respect to **Claim 45**, Kredo further discloses:

The deployment platform comprises:

A communications interface; and at least one of: a script server; a voice gateway; or an

automatic speech recognition server *(communications interface and script server, Col. 2, Lines*

40-49).

12.   **Claims 2 and 12-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Marx et al in view of Kredo et al and further in view of Uppaluru *(U.S. Patent: 5,915,001).*

With respect to **Claim 2**, Marx in view of Kredo teaches the method for designing an

interactive speech application utilizing a remote central repository as applied to Claim 1. Marx

in view of Kredo does not specifically suggest that a deployment environment for the speech

application utilizes a voice gateway, however, Uppaluru teaches the use of a voice gateway in an

interactive voice response system *(Col. 4, Lines 38-51; and Col. 6, Lines 6-46).*

Marx, Kredo, and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in interactive voice interface systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Marx in view of

Kredo with the voice gateway taught by Uppaluru to provide a means of accessing additional

Internet data through an interactive voice response system *(Uppaluru, Col. 1, Line 39- Col. 2,*

Line 19; Col. 4, Line 38- Col. 5, Line 2).

With respect to **Claim 12**, Marx further discloses a speech recognition engine *(Col. 7,*

Lines 29-46). Also, Uppaluru teaches a voice command interpreter *(Col. 6, Lines 24-46).*

With respect to **Claim 13**, Uppaluru further teaches a telephone interface *(Col. 6, Lines*

24-30).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Uppaluru teaches a means for providing prompts to a user (Col. 6, Lines 24-46, while Marx teaches that prompts may be generated using a speech synthesizer *(Col. 18, Lines 30-45)*.

With respect to **Claim 15**, Uppaluru teaches ASR implemented at a voice gateway *(Col. 16, Line 50- Col. 18, Line 15)*.

Conclusion

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached at (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/James S. Wozniak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626